DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 807 JC 780 086

AUTHOR Weddington, Doris
TITLE Faculty Attitudes in Two-Year Colleges: A Review of the Literature, 1960-1974.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 88p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Demography; Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; *Junior Colleges; *Literature Reviews; *Research Reviews (Publications); *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This literature review focuses upon studies which classify two-year college faculty by demographic and experiential typologies, particularly those studies relating faculty demographic and experiential characteristics to their attitudes towards specific community college concepts. The first section presents observations and recommendations expressed by leaders in the community college field, including faculty attitudes toward different types of students, comprehensive community college policies and community college practices, as well as suggested relationships between faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes. The second section reviews surveys of faculty characteristics and opinions. The third section examines systematic research studies attempting to relate faculty characteristics to faculty attitudes. The fourth section presents a tabular display of the findings of the review classified by nine dependent attitudinal variables and twelve independent variables in faculty characteristics, and providing the specific attitudinal variable in the study reported, nature of relationship, statistical significance, survey or study, geographical scope, investigator, and year. A bibliography of the literature cited completes the document. (LH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED149807

# FACULTY ATTITUDES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 1960 - 1974

Doris Weddington

University of Texas, 1975

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris Weddington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 780 086

Copyright

by

Doris Clinard Weddington

1975

This literature review is adapted from the author's doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1975.

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| FACULTY ATTITUDES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 5 |
| Observations and Recommendations Concerning Faculty Attitudes (from the Literature) | 6 |
| Attitudes of Faculty Toward Different Types of Students and Toward Comprehensive Community College Policies and Practices | 7 |
| Suggested Relationships between Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Attitudes | 22 |
| Surveys of Faculty Characteristics and Opinions | 34 |
| Research Studies Relating Faculty Characteristics to Attitudes | 50 |
| Summary of Findings in the Literature Review | 63 |
| Bibliography | 74 |

## FACULTY ATTITUDES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes have been the subject of a great deal of writing in the two-year college field and, in the last decade, have provided the questions for an increasing number of surveys and systematic research studies. Two-year college faculty have been dichotomized as "liberal vs. conservative" (Blocker, et al., 1956, p. 135-136), "progressive vs. traditional" (Kerlinger, 1958, "realist vs. rationalist" (Thornton, 1966), and "student-oriented vs. subject-oriented" (Koile and Tatem, 1966, and Friedman, 1967). They have been classified by reference group identification (Medsker, 1960), by orientation of previous experience (Friedman, 1967), by personality type (Brawer, 1968), and by a variety of demographic and experiential typologies. In this review of the literature, the focus will be on studies which classify two-year college faculty by demographic and experiential typologies and particularly on those surveys and studies which relate demographic and experiential characteristics of faculty to their attitudes toward specific community college concepts.

The decade of the 1960's marked the metamorphosis of the two-year college, seeing as it did rapid evolutionary movement away from the baccalaureate-oriented junior college and separate technical institute toward the open-door comprehensive community college. Garrison (1975) notes that Medsker's 1960 work marked the beginning of the literature of the community college. "But it wasn't until the late

1960's that a solid, substantive literature began to appear" (p. 58). It is the decade of the 1960's and the first four years of the 1970's, therefore, with which this literature review will be concerned.

Attempts to describe faculty characteristics and attitudes and to identify relationships between them have taken three forms: (1) observations and recommendations; (2) surveys of faculty characteristics and opinions; and (3) research studies seeking to identify statistically significant relationships between faculty characteristics and attitudes. The first section of the literature review will be devoted to observations and recommendations expressed by leaders in the community college field; these will be arranged according to the variables established for this review. The second section will review surveys of faculty characteristics and opinions; these will be presented chronologically. The third section will report systematic research studies which have attempted to relate faculty characteristics to faculty attitudes; again, chronological order will be used. The final section will present a tabulation of the findings in the literature classified by nine dependent and twelve independent variables.

## Observations and Recommendations Concerning Faculty Attitudes

As the two-year college has become more comprehensive in its offerings and open in its admission policies, concern has increased for the attitudes of two-year college faculty toward different classifications of students and toward various innovative policies and practices which seem to be moving the community college farther and

farther away from familiar academic tradition. Recognizing that faculty attitudes must be positive if the community college is to fulfill its expanding mission, interest has also increased in determining what demographic and experiential characteristics of faculty might predict positive attitudes. This section will review observations and recommendations in the literature concerning (1) the attitudes of faculty toward different types of students and certain comprehensive community college policies and practices, and (2) suggested relationships between certain faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes.

## Attitudes of Faculty Toward Different Types of Students and Toward Comprehensive Community College Policies and Practices

The importance of faculty attitudes to the success of the community college mission is unquestioned. The consensus among community college leaders is expressed in the report of the 1972 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges:

> Community and junior colleges cannot achieve the many goals they have set for themselves without competent faculty, counselors, and administrators who understand the mission of these colleges and the nature and variety of students who attend them (AACJC, 1973, p. 146).

Medsker and Tillery (1971) express the same generally accepted view:

> The problem reflected by staff attitudes is serious because, if the staff is not in harmony with the expectations held for the community college, those expectations may not be realized (p. 91).

Attitudes toward types of students

As the multi-purpose institution becomes increasingly the two-year college of the present, faculty in one-time single-purpose institutions are faced with the necessity of dealing with students from programs outside their own educational orientation. A number of studies have been conducted concerning attitudes of faculty toward the inclusion of various programs in the curriculum of two-year colleges (see studies in this chapter concerning the comprehensive community college concept), and a number of writers in the field have pointed out the need for faculty acceptance of students in these different programs. Cosand (1968) predicted that, in the community college of 1980,

> . . . the isolation of the subject-matter specialist will be a thing of the past . . . . The English teacher will be concerned with the students in technical education, the philosophy teacher with the physical-education major, the artist with the retailing student, and the mathematics instructor with the musician (p. 144).

Greco believes that the need for a better understanding of students is real, even within the faculty member's own discipline. He states that the vocational instructors in technical colleges need a more "thorough understanding and appreciation of technical college students, their characteristics, needs and aspirations" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 67). His advice is no doubt equally applicable to vocational and technical faculty in comprehensive community colleges.

Most students who enter two-year institutions may be categorized as having "special needs." These students are typically assigned to some type of remedial or developmental program. It is estimated that approximately 70 to 75% of all students in two-year institutions fall

in this category (O'Banion, 1972, p. 93). Of nearly 300,000 people who took one or more courses in North Carolina community colleges and technical institutes in 1970, 47.5% enrolled in work at the elementary or secondary level (Gleazer, 1973, p. 14). The attitudes of faculty toward these students is believed to be a major determinant of student success. It has been well documented (Bloom, 1971; Rosenthal, 1968) that teacher expectations are closely related to student achievement.

Moore (1970) points out that "a majority of teachers in the community college . . . would prefer to instruct students who represent the academic elete . . . ." According to him, "many teachers assert that low-achieving students and the developmental programs . . . necessitated by their presence are of little or no concern to them." He further notes that "more criticism and hostility toward the developmental program come from the faculty than from any other source" (p. 81). Moreover, he says, "some instructors who work with marginal students are hypocritical . . . . Repeatedly, one gets off-the-record information from teachers in developmental programs which indicates that they do not like the job or support the program in which they work" (p. 80).

Instructors who teach developmental classes frequently feel that their role is different from other instructors, and that they have been "isolated" from their preferred reference groups (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, p. 113). Community college instructors, as well as those in universities, are concerned about "status" and maintaining their proper identity with higher education. "Teaching remedial or developmental courses does not identify the instructor with higher

academia" (Roueche, 1972, p. 9).

Some of this negativism seems to be avoided when instructors for developmental courses are volunteers for this particular assignment. Roueche and Kirk (1973) found that the teacher in the effective developmental program is a volunteer. "He is teaching these students because he believes they are capable of achieving" (p. 8). Roueche and Kirk further report a conclusion concerning voluntary assignment of instructors:

> The attrition rate for low-ability students was excessively high in those situations where instructors . . . were routinely given a remedial course or high-risk students as part of their normal . . . duties. The negative feelings of instructors were quickly communicated to students . . . and high-risk students prematurely left the college in great numbers (p. 23).

Moore (1970) states a similar observation:

> Teachers who work in the developmental program of their own volition do not normally exhibit the negative attitudes toward their students that teachers who are assigned such work against their will exhibit (p. 162).

But, according to Moore, the need for positive attitudes toward developmental students is not confined to the developmental classroom. He points out that "There are . . . other faculty who will not have any direct responsibility for developmental programs but who will have definite ideas about who should come to college or may have some rejection of students from the remedial program moving into certain programs in the college (p. 162).

Roueche and Kirk (1973) report a follow-up study on students who completed effective developmental studies programs. They found that attrition accelerated and achievement declined as students entered traditional college classes. These researchers believe that negative

faculty attitudes account for these students' lack of success in the regular transfer program, that in these courses they encounter teachers with different attitudes, "whose value systems are different from those of faculty they associated with in their developmental program" (p. 77). They further hypothesize that "negative faculty expectation is a major factor in the dramatic reduction in gradepoint average experienced by (these) students" (p. 90).

In view of these problems with faculty attitudes toward developmental students, it is not surprising that a 1969 survey revealed that "49 to 60% of all students who enroll in remedial or preparatory English classes eventually receive a grade of D or F, that only 20% later enroll in credit English classes, and that of these 75% withdraw the first year" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 93).

Today's two-year college faculty member is faced, not only with teaching students from a variety of community college programs, but also with teaching the different types of non-traditional students who are enrolling under open-door admission policies in many institutions. Commonly included in the term "non-traditional" are four types of students of interest in this study: ethnic minority students, culturally deprived students, slow learners, and underachievers.

In 1969, the American Association of Junior Colleges outlined characteristics which should be sought in community college faculty. Among those considered most important was an understanding of "the profile, culture, goals, and values of the diverse student population" at community-junior colleges.

Moore (1970) addresses the problem of prejudice quite directly. "The research," he says, "reveals that more teachers than we would expect are ethnocentric, provincial, and bigoted in their attitudes" (p. 163). He goes on to make some suggestions concerning criteria for the selection of instructors for non-traditional, high-risk students:

> The person who is to work with high-risk students should be socially conscious . . . . If the person seeking the teaching position expects the program (for these students) to be an academy for teaching of domestics, then, he should not be considered a a serious applicant for the position . . . . Teachers who reject students whose demeanor and other characteristics suggest certain kinds of dissent are obviously not ones that would be readily acceptable (p. 149-150).

Larnie Horton, then president of predominantly black Kitrell College in North Carolina, is quoted from a 1971 speech at the University of Texas:

> There are many white "liberals" who discuss in the comfort of their living rooms the terrible plight of blacks and browns. Intellectually they want to do something to alleviate the problem. Yet, those same individuals may not feel at all comfortable in dealing with blacks and browns on a personal level . . . . If an individual's gut-level reactions aren't reflective of his verbalizations, he should not be working with such students (Roueche and Kirk, 1973, p. 83).

After a year of research, which included interviewing faculty from coast to coast, Gleazer (1973) expresses concern for the ethnic minority student. He points out that, in 1971, 30% of the full-time enrollees in community colleges were other than Caucasion; and that a steep increase in this proportion has been experienced since that time (p. 21). "For community colleges to serve (minority) students well," he continues, "faculty members must be sensitive to (their) special needs . . . and committed to the philosophy that all are to be served and that all are capable of learning" (p. 37).

Most writers tend to mention ethnic minority status and cultural deprivation in the same sentence as if the two concepts could be counted on to consistently coincide. Two references were located, however, which express concern for faculty attitudes toward the culturally deprived student without making assumptions about his ethnicity.

Cosand (1968), in describing the community college faculty member of 1980, states that "1980's faculty and staff must understand the socio-economic backgrounds and pressures which affect two-year college students."

Gleazer (1973), listing four broad faculty competencies which will be required to meet the challenge of the most diversified student groups in the community college of the future, included "the ability to relate to people from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and to be in touch with the community the college serves" (p. 67).

Community college administrators in 1973 registered their concern for culturally deprives students. In a survey of 697 two-year colleges conducted by José Chávez for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, these administrators reported plans for 240 inservice staff-development workshops. Of these 240 workshops, 221 were to focus on faculty attitudes toward culturally deprived students and the development of special instructional methods for teaching them (Chávez, 1973).

In discussions of "hard-to-teach" students, "slow learners" and "underachievers" are often grouped into a single classification. Most community college instructors, however, would insist that these two types of students present quite different sets of problems in the

classroom. In the traditional classroom setting, both of these student types fail to achieve to the level of the average student; but their lack of achievement can be traced to different causes.

The "slow learner" is the student who is unable to keep pace with average students even though his effort to learn is average or above average. Patricia Cross (1971) predicts that among the New Students to higher education will be those whose performance at academic tasks in the past has been below average. "Low academic ability," she adds, ". . . will be the distinguishing characteristic of these students . . . . (They) have educational problems; they do not perform traditional educational tasks with competence" (p. 12).

O'Banion (1972) places an understanding of slow learners as a top priority need in preservice and inservice faculty development: "The greatest lack of understanding and, therefore, the greatest need for understanding students may concern the 'low-ability' or 'marginal ability' students" (p. 67).

Cohen and Brawer (1972) address the problem of faculty attitudes by saying that many two-year college instructors chafe at teaching students of marginal ability.

> Whether community college psychology teachers, teachers-in-training, or teachers in general are being surveyed, the same feeling is frequently evident . . . . These attitudes can result in a self-fulling prophecy: The students are poor, unappreciative, lacking in basic skills, and unmotivated. Why should I bother to try? And the dropout and failure rate grows apace (p. 113).

Moore (1970) observes that "teachers no longer attempt to conceal their lack of knowledge and understanding of the marginal student." He notes further that those teachers who seem particularly skilled in working with marginal students "do not construe (such work) as an

illegitimate extension of their proper function. There are other faculty, he continues "who feel differently. This latter group of teachers feel that their proper function and that of the college is maintaining standards" (p. 21). Faculty who feel negatively about working with poorly prepared students tend to make assumptions about the students and the causes of their academic deficiencies. Moore notes that "arbitrary assertions and assumptions . . . about the student who needs help in basic skills (tend to) preempt attempts to ameliorate the problem" (p. 22).

The underachiever differs from the slow learner in that the underachiever is assumed to have the ability to succeed, but, for any of a variety of reasons he does not apply himself to the learning tasks required for success.

Cohen and Brawer (1972) consider the effect that the underachiever may have on faculty morale and the reactive effect that the resulting teacher attitudes may have on the students themselves.

> Unmotivated students can cause an instructor to shrink away from them as human beings. In self-defense, the instructor . . . may resist close interaction with (these) students. This can lead to charges that some instructors do not care about students . . . . Yet the instructor may actually be attempting to save himself from despair and fears of self-doubt (p. 113).

Attitudes toward community college policies and practices

The open-door comprehensive community college in which a wide spectrum of programs are offered to an extremely heterogeneous student body is clearly the wave of the future. Future-oriented writers all

agree that this is the direction the two-year college must take if it is to play an important and distinctive role in American education in the 1980's. Trends throughout the 1960's and the early 1970's make it clear that this future is already arriving in every part of the nation. The most studied question relative to faculty attitudes at this time is the question of faculty support for the "comprehensive community college concept" or the "community college philosophy." Although variously defined, these concepts consistently include the idea of a multi-purpose institution and the ideal of an open-door admissions policy. In the present study, these two concepts will be treated separately; references in the literature, however, usually combine them to some extent.

Cosand (Medsker and Tillery, 1971) believes that faculty and staff acceptance of the comprehensive community college philosophy is imperative and that it is inseparable from the philosophy of the open-door:

> The leadership, the faculty, the boards must be committed to the democratization of the community colleges' instructional program if these are to be "open-door" colleges in truth instead of fiction. Apology programs in career education, developmental learning, continuing education, community service, and counseling and guidance will not suffice. The emphasis primarily on academic transfer programs, with anemic attention paid to the other stated goals, must of necessity transform the open-door concept into a "revolving-door" actuality (p. 157).

Some writers in the late 1960's seemed to feel that the comprehensive nature of the two-year college had already been substantially accepted by the faculty who staff these schools. Garrison (1967), after interviewing 815 junior college faculty in 14 institutions across the nation concluded that, as a whole, faculties were excited by the

challenges of teaching in such comprehensive institutions. The concerns of the faculty interviewed ran along the lines of professionalism and self renewal; the diversity of student bodies and of programs seemed already to have been accepted. Apparently agreeing with Garrison's observations, Cross (1969) made the statement that two-year college teachers "are hearty in their endorsement of the philosophy of the junior college as a flexible institution" (p. 4).

Yet, looking from a vantage point well into the decade of the 1970's, observers have pointed out that the unified faculty dedicated to the democratic philosophies of the comprehensive community college is still a rarity. Roueche and Kirk (1973) describe the two-year college as a "unique, multipurpose institution catering to a non-traditional student body." Then they observe that many community college faculty members are not in agreement with this purpose (p. 9). O'Banion agrees, stating that "too many community college staff members hold values, attitudes, and beliefs that are the antithesis of community college philosophy" (1974, p. 33). Cosand, also, believes that the faculty who are unified in their community college philosophy is a hoped-for condition to be realized in the future. Writing in 1968 about the community college of 1980, he predicted that

> the community college of 1980 will search the universities for . . . imaginative (faculty) . . . . They will reject the academician interested only in some narrow aspect of his discipline. They will employ only those who believe wholeheartedly in the philosophy of the community college and who are dedicated to a service for all the people (p. 140).

If it is to succeed in reaching its goals, the community college cannot be a collection of schools, each focusing narrowly on

its own specialization. Descriptions of the community college as an institution made up of guidance services, transfer and not-for-transfer programs, credit or not-for-credit courses "are as outdated as the false dichotomy isolating academic and vocational-technical offerings." The comprehensive community college and its teachers can no longer be understood in these terms" (Cohen, 1971, p. 35).

Medsker and Tillery (1972) emphasize the peculiar urgency of faculty acceptance of institutional goals in the two-year college:

> A study of attitudes in any type of educational institution might reveal no greater degree of harmony than (exists in) community colleges, but since the functions, program, and services of the community college are so diverse, it is particularly essential that those who work in this institution not be rejecting of its goals (p. 92).

Although generally treated as an inherent part of the community college philosophy, the open-door policy has sometimes been singled out for special concern.

As early as 1965, Johnson pointed out that the "open-door" college "was becoming a reality." He further stated that "most public junior colleges (now) admit all high school graduates, and, in some states, applicants over eighteen who can benefit from the experience." (p. 22).

Garrison (1967) found that two-year college faculty members were deeply concerned about their professionalism. "They are being asked to implement a policy (they)had no part in formulating: namely, the 'open-door,' or 'after-high-school-education-for-everyone-who-wants-it'" policy (p. 15). He observed further that teachers' instructional aims were student-focused. "Yet there was a strong insistence on maintaining standards. Most teachers feel that the

open-door is valid, but that if the students don't come up to standards after a reasonable time, they will and must 'flunk out'" (p. 18).

Moore (1970) expressed concern that the community college has not learned to deal with the students who come in under the open-door policy. The fact that some of these students were accepted in the first place is seen by some faculty members as an inherent weakness in the college (p. 11).

In 1972, Thornton observed that even faculty who express acceptance of the open-door in the abstract have difficulty dealing with its day-to-day implications.

> The concept that dropouts and disadvantaged persons deserve a chance at and can succeed in higher education, if the teaching is effective, is more readily espoused by administrators than by the teachers who have to meet the students without adequate preparation for the problems they pose (p. 136).

Bushnell (1973) reports the opinions of faculty surveyed as part of Project Focus:

> (An) analysis of faculty support for selected goals of the two-year colleges . . . demonstrates that many faculty members do not fully endorse the concept of the open-door. The position is understandable when one realizes that the responsibility for educating a mixture of low-achieving or under-achieving students and more able students falls squarely on the shoulders of the faculty (p. 39).

The effort of the community college to meet the needs of students with widely divergent interests and abilities involves experimentation with new academic policies and instructional forms. Two such innovations which are receiving increased acceptance in the community college are non-punitive grading and individualized instruction.

Innovations in grading systems, including non-punitive systems, are currently being reported in the literature. In 1971, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers published a survey of member institutions which reported the following findings: (1) about one-half the institutions used traditional grading systems; 46% indicated that they were using grading systems that combined traditional and non-traditional policies; and 2% stated that they were using non-traditional systems exclusively; (2) 51% of the responding institutions indicated use of the pass-fail, or credit-no-credit grading policy; (3) 31% accepted credit without question when some, but not all, of the grades on the transcript were non-traditional; (4) the rate of major changes in grading systems seemed to be accelerating; and (5) 41% predicted that their grading system would become less traditional (AACRAO, 1971).

In 1973, Caldwell surveyed the literature concerned with innovative grading practices. This survey revealed a variety of practices in use in higher education, and particularly in community junior college. His annotated bibliography included 56 reports of experimental systems and proposed innovations.

There is, then, indication of growing interest in innovative grading policies, particularly in the two-year college. Still, no references have been found relating specifically to faculty attitudes toward innovative grading practices in general or non-punitive grading in particular.

The admission to post-secondary education of students from the entire range of academic aptitude and previous preparation implies

that the admitting institution will be prepared to meet the individual needs of these students. Some leaders in the two-year college field are convinced that individualized instruction is one important means toward meeting these needs.

Gleazer (1973) concluded that the community college of tomorrow will be made up of students of all ages, with increasing diversity in aspiration patterns, and coming increasingly from the lower quartiles of their high school classes. One of the four competencies necessary for meeting this challenge, according to Gleazer, is "competence in the individualization of the learning process" (p. 67).

Roueche (1972) presents and compares a number of educational philosophies and related teaching methods, then concludes that "for maximum effect instruction should be individualized" (p. 41). He further stipulates that "learning should be a systematic process which allows for individual learning rates" (p. 45).

Most research, however, indicates that individualization of instruction in the two-year college is a goal that will be very difficult to reach. Keuscher (1970) states that many teachers view themselves as the person "in charge" and that they find it very difficult to view themselves as managers of a learning environment rather than as directors of learning. According to Keuscher, the reason most schools are doing little more than talking about individualized instruction is that teachers are dominating the scene, doing the evaluating, determining and limiting the alternatives, and setting the goals (p. 17).

Carlson (1965) makes a similar observation. He documents a situation in which instructors in a "highly individualized" learning

environment were found to be circumventing the intent of individualized instruction to the extent of outright sabotage (p. 78).

In the face of repeated findings that instructors resist individualizing instruction, Nichols (1972) finds it a "curious fact that teachers everywhere declare their belief in the individualization of instruction. To do otherwise, they feel, would be like going on record as being against apple pie and motherhood" (p. 52).

In a study at Washington State University, Hill (1971) found a similar inconsistency in what instructors verbally espouse and what they are, in fact, willing to do. These teachers declared their desire to make changes in their curriculum and their teaching methods and to institute major innovative programs. But, these same teachers, by almost unanimous consent "named indivudualized instruction as a change they do not desire to make and will not attempt" (p. 425).

In view of the many ways instructors have devised to resist individualized instruction even while working in an individualized setting Esbensen (1968) advises that "all teachers in the individualized instruction program should be volunteers. "There is no faster way," he concludes, "to kill a program than to staff it with reluctant dragons" (p. 2).

## Suggested Relationships between Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Attitudes

Relationships between faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes have long been intuitively assumed. Observations and

assumptions concerning such relationships have frequently been stated independent of systematic study. This part of the literature review will present such observations and recommendations found in the writings of community college leaders. Some of the assumptions are borne out by survey information and statistical studies to be reported later in this chapter; others have, to date, found no support in systematic research.

For the purposes of this review, faculty characteristics will be classified as demographic data, educational background, work experience, socio-cultural exposure, and circumstances of current employment.

## Demographic Data

Two demographic variables have been frequently studied: age and sex. These variables have been included in surveys of faculty characteristics, in most profiles of two-year college faculty, and in a number of studies which attempt to relate faculty characteristics to attitudes. The only broad statement concerning either of these demographic variables which was located in this review of the literature was a statement by Cosand in 1968. Having stated that the community college of 1980 must be staffed with faculty who are committed to the comprehensive community college philosophy, Cosand goes on to say that "age is no factor in determining who these creatively discontented people are" (p. 140).

Educational Background

There has been for some time a great interest in the preservice preparation of community college faculty, particularly in their preparation for the expanded mission and the heterogeneous student body now typical of these institutions.

The concerns being expressed in recent years are more for the quality of formal educational preparation than for its quantity. In fact, there is a widespread suspicion that there may be an inverse relationship between the attitudes of faculty and the degrees they hold. O'Banion (1972) explains the deficiencies in community college teacher preparation and then adds, "the lack of adequate preparation does not ease as the faculty member gains more graduate credits. In fact, the problems . . . increase . . . . As a faculty member accumulates graduate credits, he may strengthen his prejudices against the community-junior college and its students" (p. 100).

Glenny (1971) states his concern about the effect the increasing Ph.D. surplus may have on the two-year college:

> As we look toward the next decade, it would be tragic, if not disastrous, for the surplus products of our research-oriented graduate schools to end up teaching in the junior and community colleges. These are institutions which require the highest caliber of teaching, attracting as they do students with a very wide range of abilities and interests (p. 4).

Medsker and Tillery (1971) address the same problem and agree:

> The growing number of individuals (with doctorates) who appear to have difficulty in obtaining employment could lead many to seek and obtain positions in junior colleges. However, persuasive arguments can be advanced for specifically designed programs to prepare junior college teachers. There are new demands for such programs growing out of an increasing awareness of the dangers inherent in a system which recruits faculty who are neither

> familiar with, nor concerned about, the role of the community college, (and) who have no concept concerning the nature of its student body (p. 99).

O'Banion (1972) comments on the suitability of the Ph.D. to community college teaching: "Committed to research grounded in a discipline, educated in an elitist environment, and initiated into university academe, the Ph.D. is . . . the antithesis of the model (faculty member) needed for the community-junior college" (p. 100).

A component of some graduate programs which is almost universally recommended by writers in the community college field is a course (or courses) on the community college--its history, its goals, its role in modern society, its organization, and its students.

As early as 1949, the American Council on Education suggested that the primary need in preparation programs for junior college faculty was "a clear conception of the philosophy and background of the institutions, their relationship to the whole educational structure, and especially their place in the community."

Gleazer (1965) asserted the importance of "an understanding of the broad sweep of junior college education" for prospective junior college teachers. "Therefore, preservice preparation should include careful study of the philosophy and nature of the junior college and the characteristics of its students" (p. 27).

In 1969, The American Association of Junior Colleges went on record saying that the first preservice training need of two-year college instructors was to know "the historical role of the two-year college and its future place in American higher education" (AACJC, 1969).

Wattenbarger (1971) states that "faculty members who are considered by junior college people to be most successful are those who have had at least one course or some direct experience with a course which deals specifically with the community college as a part of the total scheme of higher education."

The attitudes of many faculty, however, indicate that they do not believe in the philosophy of the community-junior college. Kelly and Connolly (1971) indicate that this apparent disbelief is due to the absence of a lucid projection in most preservice programs of the institition's role and of the faculty member's role in the institution.

A 1969 survey by the American Association of Junior Colleges sought the opinions of 288 community college senior administrators about the needs for faculty inservice education. The need most often mentioned by these administrators was for a course concerning "The Philosophy, History, and Goals of the Two-Year College" (AAJC, In-service, 1969). A follow-up survey conducted in 1973 revealed that the philosophy and history of the community and junior college movement was one of the most frequently mentioned areas of faculty inservice education. Seventy-two percent of the respondents listed this area as part of their inservice staff development programs (Chavez, p. 17).

O'Banion (1972) lists the qualities which a preservice program for community college faculty must generate:

> First . . . an understanding of the history and a commitment to the philosophy of the community-junior college; . . . and second . . . an understanding and acceptance of the students who attend the community-junior college (p. 86).

Medsker and Tillery (1971) and Thornton (1972) add their voices to the others who assert the importance of a course on the community college in faculty preparation programs. Medsker and Tillery list "the history of the two-year college and its place in American higher education" among the elements they see as "necessary" in the preparation of faculty (p. 99). Thornton, in a similar listing, includes "a course in the history, purposes, status, and problems of the community college" (p. 138).

A number of surveys and studies on faculty attitudes in the community college (to be reported later) have included a question concerning a "course on the community college." There is another type of educational experience, however, which is currently being recommended but which has not been included in surveys and studies to date. This is a course on human development techniques, variously interpreted and defined as "group dynamics," "human relations," "encounter group work," or "sensitivity training."

As early as 1969, an AAJC survey of community college administrators revealed a high priority interest in "group dynamics" and "human relations" workshops as faculty inservice training experiences (AAJC, 1969, p. 58).

Moore, on the other hand, doubts the efficacy of this type of inservice work in changing teachers' attitudes. He also doubts the familiar "community college course":

> Workshops, sensitivity or T-group encounters may be utilized, all of the available information about the students whom teachers teach may be provided, the philosophy of the institution may be explored, and inservice courses may be conducted. The results show, however, that none of these techniques are even minimally successful in changing faculty attitudes (1970, p. 164).

O'Banion is more hopeful. He proposes that one requirement for an adequate preservice program for community college faculty should be "the development of the 'humanistic' personality." This characteristic, he believes, "is more important than all others." As a means to this end, O'Banion suggests that "microteaching, systems learning, encounter groups (etc.) . . . provide improved bases for teaching education programs" (1972, p. 86).

Cohen and Brawer (1972) are firm in their conviction about the efficacy of human development course work:

> Although credential requirements (for junior college teachers) do not specify courses in human relations and although few preparation sequences include them, deans of instruction and others responsible for selecting and supervising community college faculty members might well take the lead in suggesting that instructors enroll in such courses. Sensitivity training workshops, group interactions, and even individual therapy can help instructors become better sensitized to their own needs and to the needs of others" (p. 158).

Work Experience

Interest in work experience as a characteristic of community college faculty dates back to the beginning of the surveys and profiles of community college faculty. Of interest in this review are three areas of previous experience which may be predictors of faculty attitudes: years of teaching experience, type of institution in which most recent previous teaching experience took place, and work experience outside education.

Total years of teaching experience is often included in surveys and has been investigated as a possible determinant of attitudes in some studies. This characteristic has, however, not come into any

particular focus in the general writing in the field.

Friedman (1967) brought attention to the type of previous teaching experience as a possible determinant of faculty attitudes. He classified two-year college instructors according to their previous occupational-educational experiences: "high-schoolers," "graduate students," and "professors." According to Friedman's typology, "high schoolers" are instructors who came to the community college from teaching positions in the public school system. They are subject-matter oriented and are disdainful of teaching methods. "Graduate Students" have just left graduate school and are now in their first teaching position. They are committed to teaching as a career, but they see the community college only as a stepping stone to a "better" position. "Professors" have come to the community college from teaching positions at four-year institutions. To them the community junior college symbolizes a permanent demotion in status.

The occupational orientation of the community college and of a large proportion of community college students has caused a number of observers to hypothesize that experience in the world of work outside education might be an important preparation experience for community college instructors. Among the list of prerequisites for community college faculty recommended by Gleazer (1973) is "work experience beyond the academic field" (p. 67).

Postman and Weingartner (1969) listed as one of their 16 proposals to improve teaching (at any level of education):

> Require every teacher to take a one-year leave of absence every fourth year to work in some field other than education. Such an experience can be taken as evidence, albeit shaky, that the

teacher has been in touch with reality at some point in his life. Recommended occupations: bartender, cab driver, garment worker, waiter (p. 139).

Kelly and Connolly, writing in 1971, made this observation:

> Faculty from various sources can be typed according to their attitudes and their demonstrated commitment to the two-year college. Future research may more clearly reveal differences that cannot be ignored, but a generalization can be made now: attitudes toward and commitment to the junior college as a place to work are tempered by previous occupational experience (p. 11).

According to Bushnell (1973), the fact that most faculty members have had limited exposure to situations outside the academic world compounds the problem of faculty attitudes:

> While it is dangerous to make sweeping generalizations, one obvious conclusion is that many of those trained and employed as teachers in community junior colleges have (only) credentials acquired in a university environment, which is geared to a different kind of student (p. 31).

Writing for the 1973 AACJC Assembly on Staff Development, Pratt (AACJC, 1974) states the case for non-academic work experience and makes a firm recommendation:

> Work experience is useful to the individual on the affective level. (It) assists the professional educator in relating to all individuals with whom he comes into contact; in understanding some problems of the faculty, students, and lay public (p. 77).
>
> . . . a reason that academic faculty appear to adhere more closely to academic traditionalism than vocational faculty may be their narrow academic preparation. Work experience could have a progressive influence upon these individuals. Economy and accountability, if not educational reasons, have forced English teachers to teach English and mathematics teachers to teach mathematics to students in all programs. When faculty members deal with the pragmatically oriented occupational student, a richness and breadth of experience will enable them to better relate to these students (p. 84).
>
> Recommendation: All individuals should be required to have a period of work experience, other than educational, before he or she is employed in any faculty or staff position in a community college (p. 80).

Socio-Cultural Exposure

It has long been hypothesized that the instructor's own background in his childhood and youth may affect his attitudes and relationships to community college students. Cosand (1968), in projecting the nature of the community college of 1980, foresaw the need to bridge the gap between the socio-economic background of the instructor and that of the students:

> To accomplish the . . . goals of the comprehensive community college, the teaching staff must rise above its own middle-class background and learn to understand the differing pressures upon students of all kinds--those from affluent communities as well as those from the inner-city ghettos (p. 42).

Bushnell (1973) observes that, according to several studies, the full-time faculty members of community junior colleges

> . . . come from backgrounds comparable to those of the students whom they teach. Such backgrounds could be described as lower middle-class, nonurban, and semi-professional. How well the upwardly mobile faculty member accepts students of comparable or lower socio-economic status is open to question (p. 31).

Few surveys of faculty characteristics in recent years have gathered data on the socio-economic background of instructors, and fewer still have asked questions concerning ethnic classification or experience in or study about ethnic minority cultures. Medsker and Tillery (1971) state:

> No specific data are readily available, but a general impression exists that relatively few junior college faculty members are from minority ethnic groups and that the social class background of many white staff members makes it difficult for them to relate to students from various ethnic groups. This situation is also found in most other schools and colleges, but it is particularly critical in the case of the junior college, in which so many minority group students enroll (p. 90).

The indictment of higher education for its neglect toward minority students was articulated by a group of black educators participating in a conference on Higher Education for the Disadvantaged in Washington, D.C., March, 1968. At the insistence of a caucus of black educational leaders, the conference adopted the following resolution:

> Whereas the majority of white faculty of predominantly white institutions of higher education still appear to be unaware and insensitive to the humanity of minority and low-income students: Be it resolved that institutions of higher education initiate aggressive and compulsory in-service training programs for developing sensitivity to minority and low-income students' problems.
>
> Moreover, educational programs serving nonwhite students must be administered, taught, and counseled by staff representing the racial or cultural backgrounds of the students (Moore, 1970, p. 45-46).

According to an AAJC survey of community college administrators in 1969, one of the high-ranking needs for inservice faculty development was "improved faculty preparation in ethnic studies" (AAJC, Inservice, 1969).

Paralleling these pleas for inservice development of faculty attitudes toward ethnic minority and low-income students are recommendations concerning preservice faculty preparation programs. According to Thornton (1972) preparation programs in universities

> . . . should make explicit provision . . . for extended exposure of every teaching candidate, no matter what his subject, to aspiring students from the cultures of poverty (p. 137).

The 1973 AACJC Assembly, considering the problems of minority and other culturally different students in the community college, made the following recommendations:

(To the AACJC:) The Association should marshall all possible resources to increase the development of culturally and linguistically diverse staff.

(To community colleges:) Colleges should devise specific programs to train minority administrators, counselors, teachers, librarians and paraprofessionals. They should provide opportunities for cultural awareness training for all staff including members of governing boards. Such awareness training should be designed to reduce (or hopefully eliminate) racism and prejudice as far as possible in the whole college environment (AACJC, 1974, p. 147).

## Circumstances of Current Employment

Three variables were identified which relate to current employment and to his employment preference: current instructional assignment, place of current employment (type of institution), and employment preference (type of institution).

Cohen (1971) declares that teachers cannot be understood in terms of "false dichotomies" such as the one which isolates academic and vocational-technical offerings (p. 35). A review of surveys and studies in the community college, however, shows that just this "dichotomy" has shown significant differences in faculty attitudes more often than any other faculty typology. The results of these studies will be reported in the following sections of the literature review, along with studies which investigate the significance to faculty attitudes of the type of institution in which the faculty member is employed and the type of institution in which he would prefer to be employed.

## Surveys of Faculty Characteristics and Opinions

During the decade of the 1960's and the first four years of the 1970's, interest increased in all aspects of the community college. The faculty of the community college was, during this period, singled out for special attention as concern arose about the extent to which the faculty in the comprehensive two-year college shared the philosophy of the multi-purpose institution and its open-door policy. Surveys of faculty characteristics and opinions began to appear in the literature more frequently than they had previously. Different investigators compiled different profiles of the "typical" community college faculty member. These investigators also began to lay the ground-work for relating a variety of faculty characteristics to faculty opinions on a number of community college issues.

In 1960, Medsker reported a survey of certain faculty characteristics and opinions which involved teachers and administrators in 74 two-year institutions across the nation. Faculty characteristics surveyed were sex, degree, previous teaching experiences (type of institution), whether or not the respondent had attended a junior college, type of institution in which the respondent would prefer to teach, socio-economic background, type of institution in which the respondent was employed, and teaching assignment (academic or applied). Of the 3,282 staff members who returned completed questionnaires, Medsker found that 72% were male. Ninety-three percent held the bachelor's degree; 74.3% held a graduate degree; and, of these, 9.7% held a doctorate. More than 64% of the group had formerly taught in

secondary or elementary schools; 27% had once attended a junior college. Seventy-three percent of the staff came from "white collar" or farm-family backgrounds.

Seventy-nine percent of the staff surveyed reported that they were either "well satisfied" or "completely satisfied" with the junior college as a place to work, but on another question, approximately one-half indicated that, if other conditions were equal, they would prefer teaching in a four-year college or university.

The respondents were almost unanimous in their agreement that the junior college should offer both the first two years of traditional college education and specialized terminal vocational education. However, there was no such universal agreement concerning other functions of a comprehensive two-year college.

Faculty members were classified according to their teaching area, as "academic" or "applied." When the responses were viewed in this light, it became clear that

> the relative importance of the various programs as expressed by the respondents is related to the teaching field of the faculty members. For example, a higher percentage of the teachers in the academic group than in the applied group in all types of colleges rated the transfer function as being very important. The opposite was true in their rating of the terminal function. Also, teachers of academic subjects were more inclined to regard general education programs for adults as more important than vocational programs for adults, whereas the opposite rating was given by the teachers of applied subjects. The percentage of teachers of applied subjects who rated the remedial function as very important was consistently higher than that of the academic staff. A higher percentage of the academic group than of the applied group said the remedial function is not important (p. 178).

Where teachers preferred to teach also related to their evaluation of the importance of the various functions in a comprehensive

community college.

> Those who indicated that they preferred to teach in a junior college were much more likely to rate terminal vocational training as very important than those who said they preferred to teach in a four-year college. Those who preferred to teach in a junior college were also much more likely to consider a remedial program as very important. The factor of whether a teacher had previously taught in a secondary school seemed to make for no consistent pattern of responses on the matter of functions. Likewise, there were no consistent differences among teachers with different family backgrounds (p. 180).

Academic teachers were more likely than teachers of applied subjects to oppose the inclusion of "trade shcool" type courses in the curriculum of the community college. Overall, it was obvious that teachers of academic subjects are less inclined than teachers of applied subjects to subscribe to the comprehensive institution.

The questionnaire also requested agreement or disagreement with the statement that "scholastic entrance requirements for junior colleges are too low for the most part." Overall, the respondents were evenly divided on this question--43% agreed, 44% disagreed. Academic teachers were more likely to agree with this statement than teachers of applied subjects. Teachers who prefer to teach in a four-year college tended to agree with the statement to a greater degree than those who prefer the junior college. Those who had not taught in secondary school were more likely to believe the standards were too low than those who had taught there.

The faculty were further classified according to the type of institution in which the faculty member was currently employed. Type of institution seemed to make a difference in faculty responses to several questions. Teachers from both academic and applied teaching

areas in extension centers rated the transfer program as very important, and a smaller percentage of them rated the terminal function as very important than did their counterparts in other types of public institutions. Academic teachers in extension centers rated remedial education as "important" less often than teachers in any other type of two-year college. Faculty in extension centers and private junior colleges registered the strongest opposition to the inclusion of "trade-school" courses in the junior college curriculum. Overall, "the responses indicate that the staff in extension centers and in private junior colleges is less in accord with the comprehensive two-year college concept than the staff in the other types of two-year institutions" (p. 183).

The findings are summarized by Medsker:

> The opinions and beliefs of those cooperating in the study varied considerably according to their position in the college, their preference as to the type of institution in which they wished to work, their previous teaching experience, and the type of two-year college in which they were employed . . . . Teachers of academic subjects were inclined to reflect a conservative attitude toward the junior college, which leads to the impression that they favored its assuming some characteristics of the traditional four-year college. The same point of view was also frequently expressed by those who admitted that they would prefer to teach in a four-year college, those who had not taught at the secondary level, and, by and large, those employed in extension centers and in private colleges (p. 200).

In 1962, Montgomery conducted a study to obtain data on the personal backgrounds of Florida junior college faculty and their attitudes toward the comprehensive mission of the public junior college. Data used in the study represented the responses of 797 full-time white faculty members. Montgomery reports differences between a group (1/6 of the total) who scored highest in their acceptance of the mission

of the junior college and a group (another 1/6 of the total) who scored lowest in their degree of acceptance. The faculty characteristics in the study included sex, age, current income, highest degree held, marital status, number of children, church interest, previous teaching (type of institution), length of time in the junior college, means of obtaining current position, and membership in educational organizations. Feelings and opinions were solicited concerning satisfaction with work in the junior college, the community in which the respondent lived, his pay, his voice in college management, his college's administration, his students, and the relative emphasis his institution should place on college transfer courses, terminal courses, and community service.

Respondents who accepted the comprehensive community college philosophy tended to be young, fairly new to the junior college, and were likely to have taught in secondary school. They tended to come from modest family backgrounds, and probably majored in one of the humanistic subjects. The rejecting group, on the other had, were older, had much more experience in the junior college, and were less likely to have taught in secondary schools. They tended to come from better-off families and probably majored in classical academic subjects. The multi-purpose nature of the junior college, especially the presence of the remedial programs, was a dissatisfaction to them. They also rejected adult vocational courses, personal counseling, and short courses for business and industry. They disliked the open-door policy and believed the transfer program should be the primary function of the two-year college.

The period 1961 to 1968 saw a marked interest in the study of new faculty coming into two-year colleges. Since community colleges were increasing so rapidly in size and in number, it was apparent that the characteristics of new faculty employed during this period of rapid growth would distinctly influence the nature of the institution to evolve out of this period.

Siehr's 1963 study of the problems of new faculty in 419 Michigan junior colleges produced a survey of 2,783 new faculty. He reports particularly the youth of the new faculty. Their median age was thirty-three; three-fourths of them were between twenty and thirty-nine. Another interesting corollary to their youth was the fact that three out of four of these newcomers came into the community college with no previous college teaching experience. An additional finding was that one-third of these new faculty members planned to remain in junior college teaching, while one-fourth openly aspired to move into teaching positions in four-year institutions.

A National Education Association survey (1965) revealed that the newly hired teachers in 547 junior colleges in the two years from 1963 to 1965 had the following characteristics: 30% came to the two-year college from positions in high schools; 24% came from graduate schools, 17% were moving from positions in four-year colleges; 12% came from government administration; 11% were leaving business occupations; and 4% had just earned their bachelor degrees.

Kelly (1968) found that of the new faculty in New York State community colleges during the two-year period 1965 to 1967, almost a quarter came directly from graduate school. Less than 20% had taught

in high school the previous year; about 15% in four-year colleges; about 16% in business and industry; and less than 10% in another junior college. Slightly over 20% had no teaching experience. Over 60% were below thirty-five years old, and almost 50% were under thirty.

The general tendency for community college faculty to come more from secondary school experience and less from four-year colleges was supported by a study of Kansas community college faculty (Good, 1968) which found that 86% had come to the two-year college from elementary or secondary schools. A contrary finding was reported by Farris (1968). His study of two-year faculty mobility in the New York metropolitan area revealed that 46% of faculty replacements came from four-year colleges and only 15% from high schools.

Doversberger (1970) conducted a survey of faculty characteristics among occupational faculty and math and science faculty in two-year engineering technology curricula in eight two-year colleges in Illinois. Some of the institutions were comprehensive community colleges; others were technical institutes. Data were collected concerning the respondents' faculty rank, highest degree held, years of teaching experience, and years of industrial experience. These data were reported in percentages by teaching area and by type of institution: academic instructors in the community college, applied instructors in the community college, and instructors in technical institutes.

Each respondent was asked to specify which of several programs he considered the most important function of the community

college. Faculty members showed an understandable preference for the programs of their own departments. Sixty-nine percent of the mathematics and science teachers believed that the college transfer program was the most important; 76.6% of occupational instructors rated the occupational program as number one.

There was more agreement between members of the academic and occupational divisions in the community college concerning admission requirements. Twenty percent of transfer faculty and 40% of the occupational faculty felt that college transfer students should be admitted on a firt-come, first-served basis; 42.2% of transfer faculty and 43.3% of occupational faculty agreed that occupational students should be admitted on that basis. A greater difference on this question was seen in the faculty from the technical institutes; no faculty in the technical institutes felt that students should be admitted to programs leading to the baccalaureate without entrance requirements based on test scores and high school grades, and only 15% felt that occupational students should be admitted first-come, first-served.

All three groups of faculty agreed that transfer students generally have greater ability, higher socio-economic background, and higher aspirations than occupational students. Concerning student motivation, however, there was less agreement. Students with high motivation were expected to choose occupational programs by 23.3% of the occupational faculty and 19.4% of the technical institute faculty, as opposed to only 8.9% of the transfer faculty.

A survey published in 1970 by the Bureau of Social Science Research (Godfrey and Holmstrom, 1970) revealed that, while community college faculty came from a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds, they were predominantly nonurban. Forty percent were brought up in a rural or small town environment; only 33% came from a truly urban setting. The fathers of 55% of community college faculty had been employed in either professional, managerial, clerical, or sales positions; the fathers of only 35% had been employed in blue collar occupations. Less than 20% reported fathers with a college degree, however, and 43% reported fathers with less than a high school diploma.

An additional finding in this survey concerned the work experience of community college faculty. The majority of the faculty responding had taught six or more years and had had considerable work experience outside education. Incidence of full-time employment outside education (excluding summer work) ranged from over 80% of the full-time teachers in technical institutes to two-thirds of those in community and junior colleges and over half of those in branch campuses. Experience in business accounted for most of the work outside education; skilled trades for males, and health services for females accounted for the next largest segments.

Higgins (1970) surveyed 361 full-time and part-time faculty in six state and five municipal institutions in Oklahoma. This investigator also followed the pattern which had been set by Medsker, gathering data on sex, age, length of employment, discipline area, previous teaching experience (type of institution), whether or not the respondent had been a student in a junior college, his degree

qualifications, and his last previous employment. He also solicited the opinions of the faculty on the "open-door" policy in two-year colleges. To the statement: "an 'open-door' (nonlimited) admission policy should operate in all public junior colleges," 68.6% of his respondents agreed (p. 10).

In this study, "72.5% of the faculty agreed with the general statement that 'the junior college should offer a flexible program which can be adjusted to the needs of society unhampered by conventional notions of what constitutes higher education.'" They believed that there was room for both the transfer and occupational programs on the same campus . . . ." (p. 18).

Writing in 1971, Kelly and Connolly add to this evidence some data from the Office of California Community Colleges. In 1969, 33% of the new public junior college faculty in California were former secondary teachers; 19% were former two-year faculty transferring from other areas; 15% were former four-year faculty; and 20% were from industry or commerce (p. 4).

Kelly and Connolly also trace the trends indicated by the degree qualifications of new faculty during the 1960's. Giving the ratio as doctorate:master's:less than master's, studies have shown that in 1961 Michigan's new junior college faculty held the ratio of 7:73:20; in 1965 North Carolina's new faculty stood at 11:75:14; New York's new faculty from 1965 to 1967 was 7:68:25; and California's new faculty in 1968 held degrees in the proportion of 4:78:18. These results can be seen to cluster rather closely around a mean of 7 new faculty with doctorate to 74 with the master's to 19 who hold less than

the master's degree (p. 5).

The 1967 Medsker survey, which included a sampling of 57 community colleges throughout the country, found the ratio of degrees held (doctorates:master's:less than master's) among incumbent faculty and staff to be 9:78:13 (Medsker and Tillery, 1971, p. 88). Ten years earlier, as a result of a similar survey in 1957, Medsker found a ratio of 10:64:16 (Medsker, 1960, p. 171). Over the ten-year span from 1957 to 1967, there seems to have been virtually no change in the proportion of doctorates in the community college. There has, however, been a major shift toward the master's degree as a minimum credential.

In 1967, Medsker conducted a survey of 57 community colleges throughout the country (Medsker and Tillery, 1971). Information was collected on more than 4,000 staff members. Medsker found that most community college faculty were in the 31 to 50 year-old bracket. Fewer than 18% were under 30; only 23% were over 50.

When categorized by immediate previous occupation, almost one-third were found to have come from the public school systems, approximately 22% directly from graduate school, 11% from four-year institutions, and 10% from positions in business or industry. A large proportion of the faculty in these fifty-seven established institutions had been in their present positions for only a short period of time. Forty-six percent had been employed by their college for a period ranging between one and three years. Nineteen percent fell within the range of four to six years.

Only 28% of the faculty surveyed had once been students in the community college. Only one-third of the respondents had ever had a course on the community college. Almost 54% of the respondents indicated that they preferred to be employed in a community college; 44% said they would prefer to be employed at a four-year college or a univeristy.

The respondents were asked whether they believed that certain types of educational programs were "essential," "optional," or "inappropriate" for the community college.

Most of the staff said it was essential for the college to offer both a transfer program and standard two-year technical curricula, but when less conventional programs were considered, the responses were not nearly so universal. Only 50% felt that occupational curricula for skilled and semiskilled trades were essential, and only about a fifth of the group thought that college should be concerned with occupational programs of less than two years' duration. Only about one-half of the respondents thought that remedial courses were essential. About one-third thought such courses should be optional and almost 16% said they were inappropriate . Almost one-half of the respondents thought that too much stress is placed on the quantity of students and not enough on quality (p. 91).

The responses varied according to teaching area and the respondents' preference concerning the type of institution in which he would like to teach.

> Teachers of academic subjects were more traditional in their points of view than were those who taught in applied fields. And those who said that they would prefer to teach in a four-

year college or university were more likely to oppose occupational and remedial programs (p. 91).

Park (1971), in his study of faculty values and perceptions in the two-year college, surveyed 238 faculty members in three junior colleges in California. The three institutions were identified as an urban college, a suburban college and a rural college. The data revealed that 50% of the subjects had attended a junior college and 17% had earned an Associate of Arts degree. The backgrounds of the instructors indicated that most of them had exceeded the educational levels of their parents; only 21% had a teacher for a parent. Occupationally, most of the parents had been below the managerial level and most ended their formal education with high school.

Included in the study were a number of questions seeking faculty opinions. The responses were analyzed according to type of institution. One such question concerned faculty preferences among methods of instruction. The type most often selected by urban faculty was the "informal lecture," while faculty in the suburban and rural colleges gave first preference to "structured discussion." Thirteen percent of the faculty in the urban college preferred "formal lecture," and 13% "audio-tutorial." In the suburban college, these proportions were 1% "formal lecture" and 6% "audio-tutorial." No member of the rural faculty selected "formal lecture" as their preferred teaching style; 25% chose "audio-tutorial."

Another question dealt with faculty preferences of grading systems. Among six choices offered, there were three choices which would eliminate the grades of D and F. One of these three nonpunitive

grading systems was the first preference of 38% of faculty in the urban college, 66% in the suburban college and 56% in the rural college.

Given a list of "problems" of faculty in the junior college, the respondents were asked to identify those they considered "important" and "unimportant." "Adapting instruction to individual differences" was rated as an "important" problem by better than 93% of the faculty in each of the three institutions. "Dealing with students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies" was rated "important" by more than 92% in each institution. These ratings indicated that these two "problems" ranked well above all others in the intensity of concern among these faculties. Park summarized in these words:

> Adapting to individual student differences and dealing with students needing special attention were thought to be major problems by almost all. This is strange, for, although "teaching" and "learning" are generally taken to mean dealing with these situations, (these instructors) feel it is a "problem" peripheral to what a junior college should be doing (p. 29-30).

Two other investigators, Mayfield (1971) and Phair (1972), reported surveys of two-year college faculty, collecting data on the same general characteristics which have consistently appeared in such studies. These surveys, like others which are not reported in this review, gathered information concerning faculty characteristics without relating these characteristics in any specific way to faculty attitudes. Mayfield, for example, gathered data from faculty concerning their race, religion, age, marital status, educational background, place of education, major, salaries, and the percent engaged in research. Phair was concerned with sex, race, age, years of teaching experience, type of previous teaching experience, degree held, and discipline area of

current teaching assignment.

As part of the 1972 study called Project Focus, Bushnell (1973) surveyed certain characteristics of faculty in a national sampling of two-year institutions. His focus was on the previous experience of community college faculty, their aspirations, and their attitudes about working in the two-year college. He found that the full-time community junior college teaching staff is 92% white, the remaining 8% being about equally distributed among blacks, American Indians, Mexican (or other Spanish-speaking) Americans, and Oriental-Americans. He found, also, that the faculties were predominantly male, with women accounting for only about 30% of the positions.

Almost one-third of the respondents in this survey had been teaching for five years or less; liberal arts faculty tended to report more years of teaching experience than occupational faculty. Of those who came to their present position from another educational institution, 49% had been employed in the public school systems and 27% had been on the faculty in a four-year college or university. One-fifth of the occupational faculty had worked in a vocational high school or technical institute, while only 3% of the liberal arts faculty had done so.

The ratio of doctorate:master's:less than master's among the faculty surveyed was 5.5:75.0:19.5. Among the academic faculty, 90% had a master's degree or higher, while only 52% of the occupational faculty had reached this educational level. This gap, however, appeared to be closing; almost half of the occupational faculty were currently enrolled in an advanced degree training program while only one out of three liberal arts faculty were similarly enrolled.

When asked in what type of employment they expect to be situated five years from now, the responses clearly varied according to the highest degree held. Fifty-six percent of the instructors holding the A.A. degree expected to still be teaching in a community-junior college; only 2% expect to be employed in a four-year college or university; 27% of this group expect not to be employed in education at all in five years. Of those with the BA degree, 64% expect to still be in the community college; 9% expect to be employed in a four-year institution. Seventy-six percent of those holding the M.A. degree expect to continue in the two-year college; 13% hope to move into a four-year college or university. Of the faculty who hold the Ph.D. or Ed.D., 57% expect to continue in the two-year college, 24% aspire to college or university teaching within the five-years projected. These findings "confirm the suspicion that some (faculty who hold doctorates) view the two-year college as a way station in their career" (p. 37).

Overall, the faculty surveyed expressed satisfaction with their work in the two-year college. "Complete satisfaction" or "satisfaction" with their college was indicated by 91%. There was essentially no difference between academic faculty and occupational faculty in their expressed level of satisfaction. When asked to indicate which of several aspects of their work they disliked most, 20% of the faculty in private junior colleges focused on the problem of working with unappreciative or unmotivated students. Only 10% of the respondents from public community colleges responded in like manner.

On the question of entrance requirements, there was evidence that many faculty members do not fully endorse the concept of the open

door. Almost a third of the survey respondents felt that community junior colleges "should screen students more than they do at present" (p. 39).

In 1974, Archer conducted a follow-up study using some of the questions from the Medsker 1957 survey (Medsker, 1960). The questionnaire was administered to almost 1,000 full-time faculty in eleven community colleges in Southern California. Comparing the findings with the Medsker survey, this investigator found that today's community college faculty is more satisfied with the community college as a place of employment than were the faculty of 1957; that most community college teachers would rather teach in a community college than in a four-year institution. He found that the majority of community college faculty now support the multi-purpose mission of the community college and that there is greater support for the open-door policy than there had been in the past.

## Research Studies Relating Faculty Characteristics to Attitudes

The decade of the 1960's has been identified by some as the period of time in which the community college became "self-conscious." It was during the last half of this decade that serious study of faculty characteristics and the relationship of these characteristics to faculty attitudes began to take shape.

One of the earliest studies of this sort was reported by Hunt in 1965. This study involved 15 California two-year colleges and

attempted to identify statistically significant relationships between teacher attitudes toward selected features of the junior college and three variables: teacher potential (a composite of academic qualifications and age), teaching assignment (transfer or vocational), and the type of college in which the faculty member was employed.

The attitudes of faculty toward community college concepts varied consistently in expected directions according to teaching assignment and potential. Moderate potential vocational teachers preferred a more comprehensive institution. Moderate potential transfer and low potential vocational teachers preferred a more limited type of college, each group choosing to limit the offerings in keeping with its own field of interest.

The type of college in which the faculty member was employed was not found to be significantly relevant to teacher attitudes, but agreement with the comprehensive community college concept was higher in large autonomous schools than in smaller schools under a unified control.

Hamill (1967) tested the reference group theory which had been proposed by Medsker in 1960; he also evaluated relationships between several other faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes. Hamill hypothesized that two-year college teachers who reject the four-year college reference group would place significantly higher value on the concept of the comprehensive community college. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings. As a result of an investigation of eight additional variables, he found that only one yielded a statistically significant difference. Teachers of applied subjects were

significantly higher in their support of the comprehensive community college concept than teachers of academic subjects. A tendency was noted toward greater support for this concept from females and from those with five years or more experience teaching in a junior college, while males and those with a greater amount of educational preparation were more negative, but these differences were not statistically significant.

In 1967, Oppelt used a semantic differential scale to evaluate the attitudes of community college faculty toward selected concepts which were considered representative of certain types of students in the comprehensive community college. Using 148 subjects in three community colleges in the state of Washington, he evaluated their affective responses according to sex, age, teaching assignment, degree held, home origin (urban or rural), blue collar work experience, years of multi-purpose teaching experience, and total years of teaching experience. The subjects were asked to evaluate twenty concepts, ten concepts representing the academic student and ten representing the vocational (trade and industrial) student.

The findings indicated that favorableness of attitude toward vocational concepts was <u>not</u> a function of sex, home origin, total years of teaching experience, or years of teaching in a multi-purpose institution.

Vocational instructors viewed all concepts more favorably than did academic instructors, with the result that vocational instructors were significantly more favorable toward academic concepts (academic students by inference) than were the academic instructors (significant

at .05) and that they also viewed vocational concepts more favorably (significant at .001).

Evaluating by other faculty characteristics, significant differences were found in attitudes toward vocational concepts depending on age, blue collar experience, and the highest degree held. Older faculty, those with blue collar working experience, and those with lower educational attainment were more favorable toward vocational concepts (and by inference toward vocational students). It was also found that vocational concepts were more favorably perceived (though not significantly) by all instructors in institutions having a high proportion of vocational programs.

Using a similar list of demographic variables, Mohorn (1969) attempted to account for faculty and administrator attitudes toward the open-door policy in community colleges. The study involved the staff of two institutions in the North Carolina community college system. One was a technical institute, the other a comprehensive community college. Data was gathered on the respondents concerning position, age, sex, tenure, level of education, previous occupation, and academic interest. A measure was also administered to determine a score for each respondent representing his attitude toward the community college open-door policy. The respondents' attitudes toward the community college open-door policy appeared to vary according to position, level of education, and previous occupation, but the effects of demographic variables on faculty attitudes toward the open-door appear to be weak.

In a 1969 study of faculty in nine Florida public junior colleges, Morrison found that instructors who had taken preservice or inservice courses in junior college education were more favorable toward the comprehensive community college concept than faculty who had not participated in such courses.

A study by Tolley (1969) in Oklahoma Junior Colleges confirmed the hypothesis that the reference group orientation of community college faculty tends to be related to the degree to which they accept certain comprehensive junior college functions. The functions with which this study was concerned were counseling, remedial courses, different admission requirements for vocational courses, non-credit vocational courses for adults, and community services. Within each of the two reference groups, the study explored possible relationships between faculty acceptance of these functions and a number of specific individual characteristics. The characteristics of concern were sex, age, marital status, social class of parents, size of childhood community, whether the respondent attended a junior college, type of degree held, teaching area, teaching experience, and non-teaching experience.

The findings showed that over 43% of the Oklahoma junior college faculty does orient itself to the senior college. In all twenty of the tests, which showed significant differences, the senior college reference group supported the more traditional liberal arts aspects of the junior college and tended to reject the comprehensive functions. Members of the senior college reference group who (1) never attended a junior college and (2) taught in the applied subject area

rejected three of the five functions. Applied subject area faculty (within the senior college reference group) rejected the remedial and community service functions and the proposition that entrance requirements should be different for vocational students. Respondents in the same reference group who had not attended junior colleges rejected the remedial and community service functions and vocational work for adults.

Williams (1969) in a study of Colorado community college faculty found little difference between academic faculty and occupational faculty in their attitudes toward forty stated purposes of the comprehensive community college. He concludes that the concept that a major difference exists between the attitudes of academic teachers and the attitudes of occupational teachers toward purposes of the comunity college is a myth. He found that the relative importance the teacher places upon academic course work and occupational course work is directly related to his teaching field, but that occupational teachers and academic teachers are basically in agreement that the community college is obligated to perform multiple functions.

The beginning years of the decade of the 1970's showed a continued increase in community college research, specifically in research on faculty characteristics and their relationship to faculty attitudes.

In 1970, Campbell reported a semantic differential study of the attitudes of Arizona adult education leaders and leadership educators. Ten adult education concepts were selected: (1) self imposed goals, (2) intrinsic motivation, (3) resource director, (4)

non-authoritarian teacher, (5) individualized instruction, (6) non-graded curriculum, (7) structured classroom, (8) programmed instruction, (9) life-oriented education, and (10) adult education. Campbell investigated the effect of characteristics of adult education leaders and leadership educators on their attitudes toward these concepts. Among the characteristics studied were age, sex, highest degree held, years of teaching experience, course work in education, and the type of institution in which they were teaching. The degree held showed a significant difference in relation to some variables, with individuals holding a higher degree being more favorable toward "life-oriented education" and "intrinsic motivation." Age was a significant predictor of attitude toward the concept "adult education" with those in the middle age bracket more favorable than those who were younger or older. The variable of sex showed a significant difference more often then any other variable, being a significant predictor of attitudes toward "self imposed goals," Non-graded curriculum," and "individualized instruction." In each case where sex proved significant, females held the more positive attitude.

In another 1970 study, Evans analyzed the impact of previous experience in the junior college on the attitudes of faculty members toward the community college philosophy. Specifically, this research analyzed whether a community college faculty member who has either been a student in a junior college, taught in a junior college, had a course on the junior college, or had some combination of the three, agrees with the philosophy of the community college more than a faculty member who has not had these experiences. Data for the study were taken from

a National Study of Community Colleges conducted by Medsker in 1965. A selection of 1,585 faculty was drawn; all of the subjects had been employed three years or less in their present community college.

Faculty who were former junior college students and faculty who had taken a course on the junior college were shown to have a statistically significant greater agreement with the community college philosophy than their colleagues without these experiences. No difference was found between faculty who had been junior college teachers immediately prior to their present position and faculty who had come from other sources. Faculty who had one of the significant experiences had a higher level of agreement than a colleague with none and faculty with both experiences had a higher level of agreement than those with only one experience. This finding tended to substantiate the hypothesis that these experiences have a cumulative effect.

In 1971, Beasley conducted a study involving faculty from 85 California community colleges. The findings indicated that there was (1) general support for the accepted purposes and functions of the community college in California with the exception of the guidance and counseling function; (2) rejection of the idea that community college transfer programs should have the same admission requirements as four-year institutions; (3) a negative reaction to the open-door policy as it operates in California, but a rejection of plans to modify the current system by adding standards similar to those used by four-year institutions; and (4) support for a plan to eliminate the WF grade as a means of alleviating the drop-out problem. Instructors' opinions on these questions were considered along the lines of 10 selected instructor

populations. The results tended to show that it makes little difference from which population samples are drawn, but there was some disagreement between the instructors of the transfer courses and the instructors in technical-vocational courses on these comprehensive community college concepts.

Bloom (1971) reported a study of faculty attitudes in Peennsylvania two-year colleges. The study included faculty in public community colleges, private junior colleges and the Pennsylvania State University's Commonwealth Campuses. Bloom compares the acceptance of faculty in these three types of institutions of community college philosophy relative to standards, goals, and faculty role. Comparisons were also made by age, degree, and teaching area. Community college faculty were found to be more positive toward the community service goals of the community college than faculty in the other two types of institutions; faculty under thirty were less concerned with traditional academic standards (including admission standards and grading standards) than those in other age brackets; instructors who held doctorates were more negative toward the community service orientation (goals) than those at other degree levels; and vocational-technical faculty were more positive toward these goals than liberal arts faculty.

Gennarino (1971), in a study of faculty in nine southwestern states, attempted to determine whether a pattern of personality needs could be established which could be considered typical of community college instructors as an occupational group. No clear-cut need-patterns were established, but findings indicated that community college instructors in the sample were very much like in their previous

experience, in their reasons for choosing to teach in a community college, and in their agreement with the purposes of the two-year college. Faculty responses were classified along the lines of several demographic and experiential characteristics including sex, age, teaching experience, and teaching area (academic or vocational-technical). A higher need for achievement was evidenced by academic instructors than by vocational-technical instructors; older instructors expressed more favorable attitudes toward teaching in a community college; and those who preferred teaching in a four-year institution possessed a less favorable attitude toward teaching in a community college.

An Illinois study by Hagen, conducted in the fall of 1971, assessed the attitudes of 700 community college faculty toward academically disadvantaged students and identified certain factors relating to those attitudes. A semantic differential instrument was used to discriminate between more favorable and less favorable attitudes. This was administered along with a questionnaire which gathered information on certain demographic and experiential characteristics of the individual faculty members. The characteristics studied were age, sex, socio-economic background, degree held, college major, years of community college teaching experience, whether or not the respondent had participated in a course on the disadvantaged student, whether or not the faculty member had taken a course on the junior college, whether the respondent agreed with the roles and functions of the comprehensive community college, teaching assignment, type of institution in which previous teaching experience took place, work experience outside

education, and how well the faculty member was prepared for his own entrance into college.

Hagen found the following groups to have attitudes which were significantly more favorable to academically disadvantaged students (Items 1 - 5 significant at a probability of .01; Items 6 - 8 at a probability of from .10 to .01):

1. Female faculty members.

2. Faculty members from lower-class precollege socio-economic backgrounds (faculty members from upper-class precollege socio-economic backgrounds perceive them least favorably).

3. Faculty members who hold less than a Bachelor's Degree (faculty members holding a Bachelor's Degree, and those holding more than a Master's Degree perceive them the least favorably).

4. Faculty members with less than one year of community college teaching (the more years of community college teaching experience the faculty members have, the less favorably they perceive these students).

5. Faculty members who have participated in a course or workshop which focused on the disadvantaged student.

6. Faculty members who agreed with the typical role and function of the community college.

7. Faculty members whose major teaching assignment is general education courses (those whose major teaching assignment is transfer courses appear to perceive them least favorably).

8. Faculty members who have participated in inservice training concerning disadvantaged students.

Factors which did not appear to relate significantly to faculty attitudes toward academically disadvantaged students were age, college major, whether or not currently assigned to teach academically disadvantaged students, minor teaching assignment, whether or not the faculty member had taken a course on the junior college, type of institution in which previous teaching experience took place, work experience outside education, and how well the faculty member was prepared for his own entrance into college.

A Virginia study reported in 1972 (Turnage, 1972), attempted to relate certain personal, experiential, and professional characteristics of community college faculty to teacher attitudes and to determine the degree to which the attitudes of the community college faculty were congruent with expressed purposes of community colleges in Virginia. More positive attitudes were found for faculty who (1) did not hold tenure; (2) had the educational attainment of at least the bachelor's degree; (3) had completed courses in guidance and counseling, mental hygiene, educational psychology, or in curriculum; (4) expressed the goal to continue in community college teaching; and (5) had been regularly involved in professional conferences, original research, or graduate study.

The following characteristics were also evaluated, but failed to demonstrate significant relationships to faculty attitudes: sex; age; geographical origin; length of time in teaching; professional rank; area of teaching assignment; number of students taught, passed, or failed; graduate degrees; undergraduate gradepoint average; academic major; year degrees were received; completion of courses in educational tests and measurements, in teaching methods, or in the community college; previous teaching experience; number of years of teaching experience; professional or occupational experience other than teaching; holding an office in a professional organization; publications; and professional reading.

In a 1973 study involving five Kansas community colleges, Scott investigated the relationships between ten faculty characteristics and faculty attitudes toward twenty concepts which, together, represented the philosophy and mission of the comprehensive community college. The demographic and experiential characteristics observed in this study were full-time or part-time teacher, major teaching area, age, sex, level of previous teaching experience, highest degree held, type of institution preferred, whether or not the respondent had experience in educational administration, and whether or not he had taken a course on the history and philosophy of the community college.

While scattered differences were found for some of the characteristics in relation to one or two of the different concepts, the course on the community college was the only variable which presented a substantial difference in overall acceptance of community college philosophy.

In 1973, Wirth conducted a follow-up study in five Oklahoma public community colleges, using the same institutions, same research design, and same instrument employed by Tolly in 1969. Biographical data was used to try to determine if sex, age, experience, educational background or social class influence attitude toward the junior community college's goals. As in the Tolly study five years earlier, no significant differences in attitudes were found based on these variables.

Other findings in this follow-up study showed a greater tendency towards acceptance of the multiple functions of the junior college. Vocational courses in the curriculum were totally acceptable to the faculty in these institutions, and the offering of remedial work for those who need it was more acceptable than it was five years earlier. However, the question designed to evaluate attitudes toward the open-door policy did not indicate a favorable attitudinal change since the earlier study.

## Summary of Findings in the Literature Review

A summary of the findings in the literature review is presented in Table I. The selection of variables used to organize this summary was based on the frequency with which different variables had been studied and the degree of interest expressed in them in the general literature.

The relevant dependent variables and independent variables selected to classify findings (for the purposes of this review) are listed in columns one and two, respectively. Column three shows the exact

wording for the dependent variable in the study reviewed; in most cases the wording is not precisely the same as the variable in our classification with which it has been equated. For example, a finding about attitudes toward the "transfer function" in the community college may by inference support other findings in the literature concerning attitudes toward "teaching transfer students." Such inference is necessary if the research on faculty attitudes is to be seen as a body of information rather than a disconnected collection of data.

As a further aid to reading Table I, a column-by-column reading of the first entry is given below.

Column 1. The dependent variable in our classification to which the reported research relates is faculty attitude toward TEACHING COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS.

Column 2. The independent variable in our classification and the reported survey is SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE FACULTY MEMBER.

Column 3. The related dependent variable in the research reported is faculty attitude toward the transfer function in the two-year college.

Column 4. The survey reported found no relationship between these variables.

Column 5. Since the reported research was in the nature of a survey and opinionnaire, it was capable of reporting tendencies

only (as opposed to statistical significance).

Column 6. This research was in the nature of a survey (rather than a statistically based study).

Column 7. The samples for this survey were drawn to represent a national population.

Column 8. The investigator was Medsker.

Column 9. The survey was reported in 1960.

Types of institutions to which references are made in Table I include TI (technical institute), JC (junior college), CC (comprehensive community college), U Ext (university extension), Pr (private two-year college), SC (senior college), and HS (high school).

In Column 4 (Nature of Relationship), some abbreviations have been used which require interpretation. For example, "Aca> Appl" is to read "Academic faculty were more favorable toward this dependent variable than were faculty in applied courses."

For further clarification or further details on any of these surveys or studies, each research project can be referenced in two ways: (1) by referring to the appropriate section of the literature review ("Surveys" or "Studies" depending on the designation in Column 6; in each section of the literature review, the literature is presented in chronological order); or (2) by consulting the bibliography at the end of this review (referenced by author and date).

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS IN LITERATURE REVIEW

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TRANSFER STUDENTS | SO-EC BACKGR | Trans Function | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Trans Function | Aca > Appl | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Aca Concepts | Voc > Aca | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | | Trans Students | None | Tendency | Survey | 8 JC IL | Doversbgr | 1970 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Trans Function | U Ext > Others | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| TECHNICAL STUDENTS | SO-EC BACKGR | Term Function | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Term Function | Appl > Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Occ Student | Occ > Tran | Tendency | Survey | 8 JC IL | Doversbgr | 1970 |
| | PREFERRED TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Term Function | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Occ Program | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Med & Til | 1971 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Term Function | Others > U Ext | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TRADE & INDUSTRIAL STUDENTS | AGE | Voc Concepts | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | SEX | Voc Concepts | None | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Voc Concepts | Inverse | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | YEARS TEACHING | Voc Concepts | None | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | SO-EC BACKGR | Voc Training | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | WK OUTSIDE ED | Voc Concepts | Blue Col> Other | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Voc Training | Appl> Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Voc Concepts | Voc> Aca | Stat Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |
| | | Occ Student | Occ> Tran | Tendency | Survey | 8 JC IL | Doversbgr | 1970 |
| | PREFERRED TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Voc Training | JC> SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Occ Program | JC> SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Med & Til | 1971 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Voc Training | Others> U Ext/Pr | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Voc Concepts | Inst w/ more VT> Others | Not Sig | Study | 3 CC WA | Oppelt | 1967 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS | SO-EC BACKGR | Remedl Program | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Remedl Function | Appl > Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | PREFERRED TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Remedl Function | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Remedl Programs | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Med & Til | 1971 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Remedl Function | Others > U Ext | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| CULTURALLY DEPRIVED STUDENTS | AGE | Aca Disadv | None | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | SEX | Aca Disadv | F > M | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Aca Disadv | Less than BA & MA > BA & PhD | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | COURSE ON CC | Aca Disadv | None | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | SO EC BACKGR | Aca Disadv | Inverse | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | WK OUTSIDE ED | Aca Disadv | None | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CONTACT W/MIN CULTURES | Aca Disadv | Course> No course | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Aca Disadv | G Ed >Tran | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| | PREV TEACHING TYPE OF INST | Aca Disadv | None | Stat Sig | Study | IL | Hagen | 1971 |
| COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE | AGE | Multipur Nature | Inverse | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1961 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | SEX | Comp CC Concept | F>M | Not Sig | Study | 3 JC CA | Hamill | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Comp CC Concept | Inverse | Not Sig | Study | 3 JC CA | Hamill | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | Others> PhD | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Purposes of CC | BA & above > Below BA | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | YEARS TEACHING | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | COURSE ON CC | Comp CC Concept | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | FL | Morrison | 1969 |
| | | CC Philosophy | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | STUDENT IN TWO-YR COL | CC Philosophy | Direct | Stat sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | SO-EC BACKGR | Purposes of JC | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Multipur Nature | Inverse | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | WK OUTSIDE ED | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Purposes of JC | Appl > Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Multipur Nature | Hum > Clas | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Comp CC Concept | Appl > Aca | Stat Sig | Study | 3 JC CA | Hamill | 1967 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolly | 1967 |
| | | Comp CC Purposes | None | Stat Sig | Study | CO | Williams | 1969 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | VT > Lib A | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | Appl > Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Med & Til | 1971 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Wirth | 1973 |
| | PREFERRED TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Purposes of JC | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Comp CC Concept | None | Stat Sig | Study | 3 JC CA | Hamill | 1967 |
| | | Comp JC Functions | JC > SC | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC OK | Tolley | 1969 |
| | | Purposes of CC | JC > SC | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnage | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | Study | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | PREV TEACHING: TYPE OF INST | Purposes of JC | None | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Multipur Nature | HS > Other | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |
| | | CC Philosophy | None | Stat Sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | | Purposes of CC | None | Stat Sig | Study | VA | Turnate | 1972 |
| | | Comm Col Philos | None | Stat Sig | STudy | 5 JC KS | Scott | 1973 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Purposes of JC | Others > U Ext & Pr | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Comm Col Goals | CC > U Ext & Pr | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPEN-DOOR POLICY | AGE | Open-Door Pol | Inverse | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |
| | | Open-Door Pol | None | Stat Sig | Study | 2 Inst NC | Mohorn | 1969 |
| | | Admission Stds | Inverse | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | SEX | Open-Door Pol | None | Stat Sig | Study | 2 Inst NC | Mohorn | 1969 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Admission Stds | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | COURSE ON CC | Open-Door Phil | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | STUDENT IN TWO-YR COL | Open Door Phil | Direct | Stat Sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | SO-EC BACKGR | Open Door Pol | Inverse | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Entrance Rqmt | Appl > Aca | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Open Door Pol | Hum > Clas | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1960 |
| | | First Come, First Served | None | Tendency | Survey | 8 JC IL | Doversbgr | 1970 |
| | | Admission Stds | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | PREFERRED TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Admission Rqmts | JC > SC | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | PREV TEACHING: TYPE OF INST | Admission Rqmts | HS > Other | Tendency | Survey | Natl | Medsker | 1960 |
| | | Open-Door Pol | HS > Other | Tendency | Survey | FL | Montgomy | 1962 |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| Variable: Attitude Toward | Variable: Faculty Characteristic | Variable in Study Reported: Attitude Toward | Nature of Relationship | Type of Significance | Survey or Study | Scope | Investigator | (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Open-Door Phil | None | Stat Sig | Study | Natl | Evans | 1970 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | First Come, First Served Admission Stds | CC> TI | Tendency | Survey | 8 JC IL | Doversbgr | 1970 |
| | | | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| NON-PUNITIVE GRADING | AGE | Grading Stds | Inverse | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Grading Stds | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | INSTR ASSIGNMT | Grading Stds | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Grading Stds | None | Stat Sig | Study | PA | Bloom | 1971 |
| INDIVI-DUALIZED INSTRUC-TION | AGE | Indiv Instr | None | Stat Sig | Study | AZ Ad Ed | Campbell | 1970 |
| | SEX | Indiv Instr | F> M | Stat Sig | Study | AZ Ad Ed | Campbell | 1970 |
| | HIGHEST DEGREE | Indiv Instr | None | Stat Sig | Study | AZ Ad Ed | Campbell | 1970 |
| | YEARS TEACHING | Indiv Instr | None | Stat Sig | Study | AZ Ad Ed | Campbell | 1970 |
| | EMPLOYED: TYPE OF INSTITUTION | Indiv Instr | None | Stat Sig | Study | AZ Ad Ed | Campbell | 1970 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACJC. Educational Opportunity for All: An Agenda for National Action. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

_____. Educational Opportunity for All: New Staff for New Students. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

AACRAO. "The AACRAO Survey of Grading Policies in Member Institutions." Los Angeles, Cal.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 546, 1971.

AAJC. In-Service Training for Two-Year College Faculty and Staff. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, August 21, 1969.

_____. Preservice Training of Two-Year College Instructors. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

ACE. Wanted: 30,000 Instructors for Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949.

Archer, Roy Robert. "A Study of Selected Variables to Determine Community College Faculty Attitudes Concerning the Community College as a Place of Employment." Ph.D. Dissertation, United States International University, 1974.

Beasley, Wilbur Smith. "Faculty Attitudes Towards the California Community College." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

Blocker, C.E., Plummer, R.H., and Richardson, R.C. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "Learning for Mastery." Evaluation Comment, Vol. 1, No. 2, May 1968.

Bloom, Karen, Gillie, Angelo C. and Leslie, Larry L. Goals and Ambivalence: Faculty Values and the Community College Philosophy. Los Angeles, Cal.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 679, 1971.

Brawer, Florence Blum. Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Bushnell, David S. Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Caldwell, J.R., Compiler. Current Research on Grading Systems of Possible Significance to Junior Colleges (An Anotated Bibliography). Los Angeles, Cal.: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 071 650, 1973.

Campbell, A.B. "A Semantic Differential Study of the Attitudes of Leadership and Leadership Educators in Adult Education Toward Learning Center Concepts." Ph.D. Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970.

Carlson, R.O. Adoption of Education Innovations. Eugene, Ore.: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

Chavez, Jose. Summary of Results: Staff Development Survey. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Cohen, A.M. and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco, Cal.: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1971.

Cohen, A.M., and Brawer, F.B. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Combs, A.W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1965.

Cosand, Joseph P. "Community College in 1980." In Campus 1980, pp. 134-148, edited by Alvin C. Eurich. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

_____. "Commentary." In Medsker, L.L. and Tillery, Dale. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The Quiet Revolution." Research Reporter, Vol. 4, 1969, 3.

_____. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Ball, Inc., 1971.

Doversberger, Betty. An Analysis of the Practices in the Teaching of Technical Mathematics and Technical Physics, Phase II. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 934, 1971.

Esbensen, T. Working with Individualized Instruction. Belmont, Cal.: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

Evans, Arthur Haines, Jr. "Faculty Agreement with the Community College Philosophy as Related to Previous Education and Experience in the Junior College." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

Farris, Theodore. "The Academic Marketplace Revisited: A Study of Faculty Mobility in Publicly Supported Two-Year Colleges in the Greater New York Metropolitan Region." Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1968.

Friedman, N.L. "Career Stages and Organizational Role Decisions of Teachers in Two Public Junior Colleges." Sociology of Education, Vol. 40, Summer 1967, 231-245.

Garrison, Roger M. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

_____. "The Literature of the Two-Year College." Change, Vol. 7, No. 3, April 1975, 58-60.

Gennarino, Elizabeth B. "An Analysis of Need-Structures and Attitudes Toward Teaching Among Full-Time Community College Faculty Members." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1971.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Preparation of Junior College Instructors." In New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College, B. Lamar Johnson, Ed. Occasional Report Number 7, Junior College Leadership Program, UCLA, 1965, 25-29.

_____. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Glenny, Lyman. "Doctoral Planning for the 1970's." Research Reporter, Vol. 6, 1971, 4.

Godfrey, Eleanor P. and Holmstrom, Engin I. Study of Community Colleges and Vocational Centers. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Research, Inc., 1970.

Good, Wallace. Faculty Profile: Kansas Community-Junior Colleges. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 023 392, 1968.

Hagen, Donald L. Community College Faculty: Some Basis for Their Attitudes Toward Academically Disadvantaged Students. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 059 711, 1971.

Hamill, R.E. "The Effects of Teachers in Four-Year Colleges and Universities as Reference Groups for Teachers in Community Colleges." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.

Higgins, A. Stephen. The Junior College Faculty in Oklahoma. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 939, 1970.

Hill, C.H. "Teachers as Change Agents." Clearinghouse, Vol. 45, 1971, 424-428.

Hill, Malcolm D., Fred N., and Blocker, Clyde E. Faculty Readiness for Innovation: A Case Study. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 057 767, 1971.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "A Need and a Proposal for the American Junior College." In New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College, B. Lamar Johnson, Ed. Occasional Report Number 7, Junior College Leadership Program, UCLA, 1965, 15-23.

Kelly, M. Frances. "Job-Seeking Strategies of Public Two-Year College Faculties in New York State." Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York, 1968.

Kelly, M. Frances and Connolly, J. Orientation for Faculty in Junior College Reading Programs. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 043 323, 1971.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. III, No. 48, 1958.

Keuscher, R.E. "Why Individualize Instruction?" In Individualization of Instruction, Virgil M. Howes, Ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970, 6-19.

Koile, E. and Tatem, D.W. "The Student-Oriented Teacher." Junior College Journal, Vol. 36, No. 5, 1966, 24-26.

Mayfield, Ann Adele. A Profile of Instructors of Sociology in Junior Colleges of the South. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 075 023, 1971.

Medsker, L.L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Medsker, L.L., and Tillery, D. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Mohorn, Donald Royce. "Relationship of Administrator and Faculty Profile of Values, Demographic Variables, and Attitudes Toward the Community College Open Door Policy." Ph.D. Dissertation, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1969.

Moore, William, Jr. Against the Odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Montgomery, Douglas Murray. "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College." Ph.D. Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1962.

Morrison, J.L. "The Relationship of Socialization Experience, Role Orientation, and the Acceptance of the Comprehensive Junior College Concept by Public Junior College Faculty." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1969.

NEA. Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64 and 1964-65. Research Report 1965-R4, Higher Education Series. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, April 1965.

Nichols, E.D. "Is Individualization the Answer?" Educational Technology, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1972, 52-58.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community Junior College. Tucson, Ariz.: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

_____. "Staff Development: A Priority on Persons." In New Staff for New Students. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

Oppelt, M.O. "Attitude of Community College Instructors Toward Student Groups as a Function of Certain Teacher Characteristics." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1967.

Park, Young. "Junior College Faculty: Their Values and Perceptions." ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, Monograph Series, 1971.

Patterson, Robert A. An Investigation of the Relationship Between Career Patterns of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty and Their Attitudes Toward Educational Issues. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 886, 1972.

Phair, Tom S. Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges. A 1972 Overview. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 070 433, 1972.

Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Pratt, Arden L. "Work Experience as a Means of Preparation and Renewal." In New Staff for New Students. Washington, D.C. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Roueche, John E. Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community College. Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

_____. A Modest Proposal: Students Can Learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Roueche, John E. and Kirk, R. Wade. Catching Up: Remedial Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Ryan, D.G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Scott, Dennis N. "Attitudes of Selected Kansas Community Junior College Faculties Toward the Role of the Junior College." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1973.

Siehr, Hugo E. Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges. Los Angeles: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 013 093, 1963.

Stanford, Nevitt. "Implications of Personality Studies for Curriculum and Personnel Planning." In Personality Factors on the College Campus, R.L. Sutherland and others, Eds. Austin, Tex.: The University of Texas, The Hogg Foundation, 1962.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College, 2nd Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

_____. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

Tolley, Charles Howard. "The Relationship of Junior College Faculty Reference Group Attitudes Toward the Multipurpose Functions of the Junior College." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Tulsa, 1969.

Turnage, Francis Shirley. "An Investigation of Teacher Attitudes Held by Virginia Community College Instructional Faculty." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1972.

Wattenbarger, J.L. "Staffing the Community Colleges: Who, Where, Why, and How?" Junior College Staffing 1975-1978. Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, 1971.

Williams, James Walter. "A comparison of Faculty Attitudes Toward Stated Purposes of the Community College." Ph.D. Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1969.

Wirth, Marian P. "Follow Up Study of Faculty Attitudinal Change at Five Oklahoma Junior Community Colleges." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Tulsa, 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 3 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES